## Case 2:04-cv-01649-DFL-CMK Document 13 Filed 11/03/05 Page 2 of 3

On March 3, 2005, plaintiff submitted a document to the court. That document reflects that plaintiff changed addresses. In the interest of justice, on October 6, 2005, the court issued an order construing the March 3, 2005, document as a notice of change of address to the following:

> Metropolitan State Hospital 11401 S. Bloomfield Avenue Norwalk, California, 90650

1

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

21

22

23

25

The October 6, 2005, order also provided plaintiff an additional opportunity to comply with the court's initial September 1, 2004, order, and warned plaintiff that failure to comply may result in dismissal of this case. The October 6, 2005, order was also returned as undeliverable.

On October 21, 2005, the court issued an order directing plaintiff to show cause in writing why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 11-110. That order was served on plaintiff at both of the foregoing addresses. The order was again returned undeliverable at either address.

The court must weigh five factors before imposing the harsh sanction of dismissal. See Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987). Those factors are: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its own docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to opposing parties; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. See id.; see also Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an appropriate sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor. See Malone, 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is appropriate where there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to follow local rules, see Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53, and failure to inform the district court and parties of a change of 26 address pursuant to local rules, see Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (per

## Case 2:04-cv-01649-DFL-CMK Document 13 Filed 11/03/05 Page 3 of 3

curiam). Having considered these factors, and in light of plaintiff's failure to inform the court of his current address, the court concludes that dismissal is appropriate. Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that this action be dismissed and that all pending motions be denied as moot. These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within ten days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). DATED: November 2, 2005. UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE